REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated September 22, 2004. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-7 and 11-16 were rejected under 35 USC §102, and claims 4 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 USC §103. By this Amendment, claims 11-16 are amended and claims 17-28 are added. Currently pending claims 1-28 are believed allowable, with claims 1, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 being independent claims.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT:

The Office Action does not indicate that the Information Disclosure Statements filed on September 14, 2004 was considered. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner return an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form, filed September 14, 2004.

CLAIM REJECTIONS:

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 11-16 were rejected under 35 USC §102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,454 to Hobbs et al. (hereinafter "Hobbs"). Office Action, page 2. To anticipate a claim under 35 USC §102, a reference must teach every element of the claim. MPEP 2131.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a network system comprising, "a web server for storing a web page that includes a function execution request object which is used to request that a process be performed by said function providing server." The Office Action states that the function execution request object is analogous to request headers described in Hobbs. The applicant respectfully submits that the request headers described in Hobbs are not comparable to function execution requests recited in claim 1.

Hobbs appears to teach a client/server information database record retrieval system. Hobbs, col. 1, lines 11-15. Without being mired in detail, Hobbs discusses generating request headers that specifies, among other things, the purpose of the request. Hobbs, col. 14, line 55 – col. 15, line 2, col. 16, lines 22-27. For example the browser may send a request header "http://www.example.com/datasite.pl?AR1" to a proxy server. Hobbs, col. 17, line 64 – col. 18, line 1.

- 8 -

In contrast to the request headers of Hobbs, a function execution request object of the present application is "included in the web page can be a button, a banner, a linking keyword, or image data etc." Application, page 5, lines 1-3. Thus, the function execution request is a user selectable object on webpage, rather than a static request header.

Claim 1 also recites, "and when said function execution request object included in said web page is selected." It is respectfully submitted that Hobbs does not teach selecting request headers. Indeed the request headers of Hobbs cannot be selected because they are static by nature. Thus, any analogy made between function execution request objects of the present invention and request headers of Hobbs necessarily breaks down in light of the above limitation of claim 1.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Hobbs does not teach the "function execution request object" claim element of claim 1, and the limitation "and when said function execution request object included in said web page is selected" of claim 1. For at least the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is believed allowable over the cited documents. As such, the Applicant earnestly solicits allowance of claim 1 by the Examiner.

<u>Claims 2-4, 17 and 18</u>

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 USC §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. MPEP 2143.03 *citing In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claims 2-4, 17 and 18 are dependent on further limit claim 1. Since claim 1 is believed allowable, claims 2-4, 17 and 18 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

<u>Claim 5</u>

Claim 5 recites, in part, "in response to the selection of a function execution request object." As mentioned above (see discussion of claim 1), Hobbs does not teach "a function execution request object" or "the selection of a function execution request object." For at least these reasons, claim 5 is believed allowable over the cited documents. As such, the Applicant earnestly solicits allowance of claim 5 by the Examiner.

- 9 -

Claims 6-10, 19 and 20

Claims 6-10, 19 and 20 are dependent on further limit claim 5.
Since claim 5 is believed allowable, claims 6-10, 19 and 20 are also
believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 5.

Claim 11

Claim 11 is amended herein to recite, in part, a "translating
process configured to translate, at least in part, the web page from a
first language to a second language." Support for this amendment can
be found at least on page 22, line 17 - page 23, line 9.

It is respectfully submitted that Hobbs does not teach a
translating process configured to translate, at least in part, a web
page from a first language to a second language. For at least this
reason, claim 11 is believed allowable over the cited documents. As
such, the Applicant earnestly solicits allowance of claim 11 by the
Examiner.

Claim 12

Claim 12 recites, in part, "in response to the selection of said
function execution request object." As mentioned above (see discussion
of claim 1), Hobbs does not teach a "function execution request object"
or "the selection of said function execution request object." For at
least these reasons, claim 12 is believed allowable over the cited
documents. As such, the Applicant earnestly solicits allowance of
claim 12 by the Examiner.

Claims 21 and 22

Claims 21 and 22 are dependent on further limit claim 12. Since
claim 12 is believed allowable, claims 21 and 22 are also believed
allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

Claim 13

Claim 13 is amended herein to recite, in part, "a translating
process configured to translate, at least in part, the target web page
from a first language to a second language." Support for this
amendment can be found at least on page 22, line 17 - page 23, line 9.

It is respectfully submitted that Hobbs does not teach a
translating process configured to translate, at least in part, a target

- 10 -

web page from a first language to a second language. For at least this reason, claim 13 is believed allowable over the cited documents. As such, the Applicant earnestly solicits allowance of claim 13 by the Examiner.

Claim 14

Claim 14 recites, in part, "in response to the selection of a function execution request object." As mentioned above (see discussion of claim 1), Hobbs does not teach a "function execution request object" or "the selection of a function execution request object." For at least these reasons, claim 14 is believed allowable over the cited documents. As such, the Applicant earnestly solicits allowance of claim 14 by the Examiner.

Claims 23 and 24

Claims 23 and 24 are dependent on further limit claim 14. Since claim 14 is believed allowable, claims 22 and 24 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14.

Claim 15

Claim 15 recites, in part, "in response to the selection of a function execution request object." As mentioned above (see discussion of claim 1), Hobbs does not teach a "function execution request object" or "the selection of a function execution request object." For at least these reasons, claim 15 is believed allowable over the cited documents. As such, the Applicant earnestly solicits allowance of claim 15 by the Examiner.

Claims 23 and 24

Claims 23 and 24 are dependent on further limit claim 15. Since claim 15 is believed allowable, claims 22 and 24 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

Claim 16

Claim 16 recites, in part, "in response to the selection of said function execution request object." As mentioned above (see discussion of claim 1), Hobbs does not teach a "function execution request object" or "the selection of a function execution request object." For at least these reasons, claim 16 is believed allowable over the cited

- 11 -

documents. As such, the Applicant earnestly solicits allowance of claim 16 by the Examiner.

Claims 25 and 26

Claims 25 and 26 are dependent on further limit claim 16. Since claim 16 is believed allowable, claims 25 and 26 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

NEW CLAIMS:

By this amendment, claims 17-28 are added to the present application. No new matter is believed to be introduced to the application by these claims. Specifically, support for claims 17, 19, 20, 23, 25 and 27 can be found at least on page 5, lines 1-3 of the application. Support for claims 18, 21, 22, 24, 26 and 28 can be found at least on page 22, line 17 - page 23, line 9 of the application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the forgoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this case is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain at issue that the Examiner feels could best be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to contact the attorney below.

A fee calculation sheet is accompanied herewith. Should any extensions of time be required, please consider this a petition thereof and charge Deposit Account 50-0510 the required fee.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 22, 2004

Ido Tuchman, Reg. No. 45,924
69-60 108th Street, Suite 503
Forest Hills, NY 11375
Telephone (718) 544-1110
Facsimile (718) 544-8588

- 12 -